

REMARKS

The Official Action mailed May 8, 2007, has been received and its contents carefully noted. This response is filed within three months of the mailing date of the Official Action and therefore is believed to be timely without extension of time. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on September 24, 2003; November 4, 2004; August 12, 2005; November 1, 2005; June 28, 2006; and August 22, 2006.

Claims 1-4 and 6-35 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 7-9, 11, 14, 17 and 22-25 are independent. Claims 1, 6-9, 11, 14, 17, 22-25, 29 and 30 have been amended to better recite the features of the present invention. The Applicant notes with appreciation the indication of the allowability of claims 1-4, 11-32 and 34 (page 6, Paper No. 20070430). For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Paragraph 3 of the Official Action rejects claims 6-8, 10 and 33 as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0210219 to Osame. The Applicant respectfully submits that an anticipation rejection cannot be maintained against the independent claims of the present application, as amended. Paragraph 5 of the Official Action rejects claims 9 and 35 as obvious based on Osame. The Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained against the independent claims of the present application, as amended.

As stated in MPEP § 2131, to establish an anticipation rejection, each and every element as set forth in the claim must be described either expressly or inherently in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

As stated in MPEP §§ 2142-2143.01, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available

to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. "The test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." In re Kotzab, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000). See also In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The prior art, either alone or in combination, does not teach, either explicitly or inherently, or suggest all the features of the independent claims, as amended. Specifically, independent claim 6 has been amended to recite that a first signal (see, e.g., CK of Figure 6A) is inputted to a source of the fourth transistor (see, e.g., 77 of Figure 6A); that a second signal (see, e.g., S of Figure 6A) is inputted to a gate of the second transistor (see, e.g., 72 of Figure 6A); and that the first signal is different from the second signal.

Independent claim 7 has been amended to recite that a first signal (see, e.g., CK of Figure 7B) is inputted to a source of the fourth transistor (see, e.g., 157 of Figure 7B); that a second signal (see, e.g., two-stage-before signal of Figure 7B) is inputted to a source of the sixth transistor (see, e.g., 158 of Figure 7B); and that the first signal is different from the second signal.

Independent claim 8 has been amended to recite that a first signal (see, e.g., CK of Figure 7A) is inputted to a source of the fourth transistor (see, e.g., 136 of Figure 7A); that a second signal (see, e.g., S of Figure 7A) is inputted to a gate of the second

transistor (see, e.g., 132 of Figure 6A); and that the first signal is different from the second signal.

Independent claim 9 has been amended to recite that a first signal (see, e.g., two-stage-before signal of Figure 6B) is inputted to a source of the fourth transistor (see, e.g., 97 of Figure 6B); that a second signal (see, e.g., CK of Figure 6B) is inputted to a source of the sixth transistor (see, e.g., 98 of Figure 6B); and that the first signal is different from the second signal.

For the reasons provided below, Osame does not teach, either explicitly or inherently, or suggest the above-referenced features of the present invention.

The Official Action appears to assert that the fourth transistor of claim 6 (see, e.g., 77 of Figure 6A), the fourth transistor of claim 7 (see, e.g., 157 of Figure 7B), the fourth transistor of claim 8 (see, e.g., 136 of Figure 7A), and the fourth transistor of claim 9 (see, e.g., 97 of Figure 6B) correspond to the fourth transistor of Osame (see, e.g., 105/106 of Figure 4 of Osame); that the second transistor of claim 6 (see, e.g., 72 of Figure 6A) and the second transistor of claim 8 (see, e.g., 132 of Figure 6A) correspond to the second transistor of Osame (see, e.g., 201/202 of Figure 4 of Osame); and that the sixth transistor of claim 7 (see, e.g., 158 of Figure 7B) and the sixth transistor of claim 9 (see, e.g., 98 of Figure 6B) correspond to the sixth transistor of Osame (see, e.g., 105/106 of Figure 4 of Osame)(pages 2-6, Paper No. 20070430). Also, the Official Action appears to assert that Osame teaches that a first signal (see, e.g., DATA of Figure 4 of Osame) is inputted to a source of the fourth transistor (see, e.g., 105/106 of Figure 4 of Osame), and that a second signal (see, e.g., DATA of Figure 4 of Osame) is inputted to a gate of the second transistor (see, e.g., 201/202 of Figure 4 of Osame) or a source of the sixth transistor (see, e.g., 105/106 of Figure 4 of Osame)(pages 2-6, Paper No. 20070430). That is, the Official Action appears to assert that Osame teaches that the first and second signals of the present invention correspond with DATA of Figure 4.


However, the same DATA appears to be inputted to the transistors 105, 106, 201 and 202. As such, the first signal of Osame is not different from the second signal. Therefore, Osame does not teach, either explicitly or inherently, or suggest that the first signal is different from the second signal, which is recited in each of amended independent claims 6-9.

Since Osame does not teach, either explicitly or inherently, or suggest the above-referenced features of the present invention, anticipation and obviousness rejections cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 are in order and respectfully requested.

Also, in order to better describe the present invention, claims 1, 11, 14, 17, 22-25, 29 and 30 have been amended to change "connected" to "electrically connected" and to change "are electrically connected" to "are each electrically connected."

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric J. Robinson
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.
PMB 955
21010 Southbank Street
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165
(571) 434-6789